

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/635,899		PETRIE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Darren W. Ark		3643	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Darren W. Ark.

(2) Jason W. Bryan.

**Date of Interview:** 20 September 2010

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Rejections of the Non-Final Action mailed on 05/18/2010*

Claims discussed:

*9, 13, 16, 18, and 21*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Prior art of record*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Darren W. Ark/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3643

**Status of Application:** Response to Non-Final

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 3:15pm EST

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner proposed amendments to the claims to overcome claim objections and 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph rejections. Examiner stated that in particular, at claim 9, lines 27-28, Examiner proposed to amend the terms "front side portion" and "rear portion" to be replaced with --front side portions-- and --rear side portions-- since it is not a single portion of each which contacts the rod as such and instead it is the front side portions and rear side portions of the lid and base portions which contact the fishing rod and different portion of the fishing rod respectively. Examiner also stated that at claim 9, lines 37-38, Examiner proposed to replace "an" before "interior" with --the-- since the term "an interior of said carrier box" was previously recited at claim 9, lines 29-30. Examiner proposed the same amendment at claim 21, lines 35-36. Examiner proposed amending claim 13 to properly correlate the structure of the at least two mating portions previously recited in claim 9. Examiner proposed deleting the second occurrence of the paragraph that begins "a pliable buffer arranged..." toward the end of claim 21 since it is redundant with respect to the paragraph which precedes it. Applicant agrees with the proposed amendment. Please see the Examiner's Amendment for details.